

A FLAWED PICTURE

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this picture:

The Republicans want to protect interest income of the wealthy. The Democrats want to protect interest payments on students loans.

The Republicans want to provide tax cuts for millionaires. The Democrats want to provide tax cuts for middle-income families.

The Republicans want to use spending reductions to pay for tax cuts. The Democrats want to use spending reductions to pay for deficit reductions.

What is wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker, is that under the Republican budget, all the money coming out of the system is going into the pockets of the rich and powerful, and all the money coming out of the system is coming out of the pockets of the middle class.

I sincerely hope we in Congress can find the right glidepath to a balanced budget but if it means the rich get richer while the middle class pays for it, count me out.

CLARIFYING THE PICTURE

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the previous speaker what is wrong with that picture. What is wrong with it is it appeals to the worst in the American people. It appeals to a call to class warfare. It appeals to a petty and vituperative kind of conduct, and it absolutely confuses the American people.

Because the fact is that it is the middle class that has been paying for decades. The middle class will continue to pay unless we create genuine tax relief, which is exactly what we have been working on on this side of the aisle. But that is what is wrong with the picture.

I was surprised to hear a member of the Democratic leadership yesterday say that he is upset with the President's budget because he does not think that Medicare should be talked about or touched in order to balance the budget. The reason I was surprised is because the fact is that even if we run a budget surplus in the year 2002, Medicare is going to be bankrupt. Medicare is a separate program. You cannot spend money that is outside the trust fund. You cannot take money from the general fund.

You have got to put your head in the sand if you will not do something about Medicare.

THE ESCAPE HATCH REMAINS OPEN FOR TAX DODGERS

(Ms. DeLAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Republican hoax. This week House Republicans promised to close the tax loophole that allows billionaires to avoid paying taxes by renouncing their U.S. citizenship.

But instead of closing this loophole, the Republicans left the escape hatch wide open.

According to the Treasury Department, this bill has the same problems as the current law that allows the super-rich to dodge paying their fair share.

While Republicans find creative ways of protecting tax benefits for the privileged few, their budget hits working middle-class families on both ends: Cutting student loans and Medicare.

Republicans love to talk about the revolution they are bringing to the House. In fact they are up to politics as usual: Big breaks for the privileged few while working middle-class families get stuck with the bill.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AMENDING THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to equalize the opportunity to raise campaign funds to incumbents and challengers.

In Federal elections, under current law, political action committees can contribute \$5,000 in a primary, \$5,000 in a general election, while individuals can only contribute \$1,000 in a primary and \$1,000 in a general election.

Last year PAC's gave \$126 million to incumbents and only \$16 million to challengers, and PAC's historically have given 90 percent of their money to incumbents and very little amounts of money to challengers.

My legislation lowers the amount political action committees can contribute from \$5,000 to \$3,000, and raises the amount that individuals can contribute from \$1,000 to \$3,000.

Earlier this year, term limits failed in this body, and I have long said we do not need term limits if we have meaningful campaign finance reform. I urge Members to support this legislation, which will level the playing field and make campaigns more competitive.

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, under the agriculture program that this country has had for a good many years, since the

1930's, the American public has eaten better for less than anyplace else in the world. Less than 14 percent of disposable income goes for the great food, the quality food that we eat.

Under the Republican budget, that is not going to be the future of agriculture, because the agriculture programs under the Republican budget have to be cut drastically, over \$9 billion in the next 5 years, cut out of a budget of only about \$17 billion.

Under the President's budget, only \$4.2 billion has to be cut for our farmers and agriculture, and we can maintain that good food supply, under the President's budget. Not under the Republican budget of the House or the Senate.

The Democratic President's budget is a lot better for agriculture, for our farmers, than the Republican budget, and I say to you that if you are interested in continuing to have a wholesome food supply in this country, you would not want to support the Republican agriculture budget.

THE LONG MARCH TOWARD BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton submitted his budget this week, and I recognize that the budget is too late. He should have done it 2 years ago.

I recognize that this budget is too long. He takes 10 years to balance the budget. He should at least try to meet us and do it in 7 years. I recognize his budget has some of the wrong priorities.

But, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the President's budget is basically a good thing. I welcome him to this debate. We need him, and I am happy to see him taking this step.

But I want to remind the President, and I want to remind each and every one of us, that balancing the budget is not a 1-day process. We are not going to balance the budget by making a proposal, having a news conference of 1 day. We are not going to do it by passing a resolution, as this House has done.

The only way we balance the budget is to keep the faith, take the political heat, make the decisions every day, every day for 7 years, until the budget is in balance. This is not a short-term process.

Now, Mr. President, I am committed to that process. That is why earlier this week I voted against funding for the B-2 bomber, even though a lot of that funding is in our district.

Mr. President, are you committed to this process? This is a long march, not a short sprint. We need you with us all the way.